

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The present Amendment is responsive to the final Office Action mailed April 14, 2009 in the above-identified application.

Claims 1-9 are the claims currently pending in the present application.

Claims 1, 5 and 8 are amended to clarify features recited thereby. These amendments are fully supported by applicant's disclosure.

Further, these claim amendments add no features that were previously un-recited in the claims, but merely remove a feature recited in the alternative. Accordingly, the present amendments to claims 1, 5 and 8 are believed to raise no new issues that would require further searching and, therefore, no Request for Continued Examination is filed herewith.

Rejection of Claims 1-3 and 5-9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-3 and 5-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being obvious from Applicant's Admitted Prior Art (AAPA) in view of McConnell et al., U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0015403 in further view of Balazinski et al., U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0167909. Reconsideration of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 5 and 8 require detecting as conversion-process information a time the conversion section spent to convert the first signal or the second signal.

As discussed in the previous Amendment, McConnell and the AAPA do not disclose or suggest such features, and in the interview conducted on December 16, 2008, the Examiner agreed that McConnell and the AAPA do not disclose or suggest such features.

Balazinski discloses a service node for a pre-paid service provision in packet data cellular telecommunication networks (Balazinski, Abstract), and that in volume-based billing, mobile subscribers are subject to fees based on the amount of data transferred over their access network, for example, based on the number of packets, and that the service node monitors the amount of data transferred (Balazinski, page 1, paragraph 7).

Balazinski does not disclose or suggest detecting as conversion-process information a time said conversion section spent to convert the first signal or the second signal, as required by claims

1, 5 and 8. Further, Balazinski does not disclose or suggest transmitting such conversion-process information to a fee-charging system, as further required by claims 1, 5 and 8. Further, the Office Action does not allege that Balazinski does not disclose or suggest such features. Accordingly, even taken together in combination, McConnell, the AAPA and Balazinski do not disclose or suggest the recitations of claims 1, 5 and 8.

Claims 2 and 3 depend from claim 1, claims 6 and 7 depend from claim 5, and claim 9 depends from claim 8. Therefore, claims 2, 3, 6, 7 and 9 are patentably distinguishable over the cited art for at least the same reasons as their respective base claims.

Rejection of Claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being obvious from AAPA, McConnell and Balazinski as applied to claims 1-3, and further in view of Agrawal et al., U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0046234 in further view of Jabri, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0027643. Reconsideration of this rejection is respectfully requested.


Agrawal and Jabri do not cure the above-discussed deficiencies of the AAPA, McConnell and Balazinski as they relate to the above-cited features of claim 1. Further, the Office Action does not allege that Agrawal and Jabri disclose or suggest such features. Accordingly, even taken together in combination, the AAPA, McConnell, Balazinski, Agrawal and Jabri do not disclose or suggest the recitations of claim 1.

Since claim 4 depends from claim 1, it is patentably distinguishable over the cited art for at least the same reasons.

In view of the forgoing discussion, withdrawal of the rejections and allowance of the claims of the application are respectfully requested.

THIS CORRESPONDENCE IS BEING
SUBMITTED ELECTRONICALLY
THROUGH THE UNITED STATES
PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
EFS FILING SYSTEM
ON June 22, 2009.

Respectfully submitted,



MAX MOSKOWITZ
Registration No.: 30,576
OSTROLENK FABER LLP
1180 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10036-8403
Telephone: (212) 382-0700

MM:GB:ck